

**ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION**

**DOCKET No. 12-0598**

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY ON REHEARING**

**OF**

**JEFFREY V. HACKMAN, P.E.**

**Submitted On Behalf**

**Of**

**AMEREN TRANSMISSION COMPANY OF ILLINOIS**

**December 2, 2013**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page No.</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>III. RESPONSE TO STAFF WITNESS MR. ROCKROHR.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>IV. RESPONSE TO MSSCLPG WITNESSES.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>V. CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>10</b>

**ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION**

**DOCKET No. 12-0598**

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY ON REHEARING OF**

**JEFFREY V. HACKMAN, P.E.**

**Submitted On Behalf Of**

**Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

**Q. Please state your name, business address and present position.**

**A.** My name is Jeffrey V. Hackman. My current position is Senior Director of Transmission Operations and Project Management for Ameren Services Company (Ameren Services), located at 1901 Chouteau Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63103.

**Q. Are you the same Jeffrey V. Hackman who previously sponsored testimony in this proceeding?**

**A.** Yes, I am.

**II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE**

**Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony on rehearing?**

**A.** I have reviewed and am responding to the rehearing direct testimony submitted by Commission Staff witness Mr. Greg Rockrohr (ICC Staff Ex. 2.0) and witnesses on behalf of intervenor group the Morgan, Sangamon, and Scott Counties Land Preservation Group (MSSCLPG) (MSSCLPG Exs. 5.0 –12.0). Specifically, I respond to Mr. Rockrohr's testimony as it relates to the location of the Mt. Zion substation. I also respond to concerns raised by the

MSSCLPG related to the impact of the Transmission Line on their property interests. Finally, I continue to explain, in response to the MSSCLPG witnesses' support for a route that parallels an existing 138 kV line from Meredosia to Pawnee, why parallel routes should be avoided when possible. The Commission can avoid the operations, maintenance, and reliability issues resulting from parallel lines by approving the Meredosia – Pawnee route that it approved in its August 2013 Order.

**Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits in support of your testimony?**

**A.** Yes, I sponsor the following exhibits:

- ATXI Exhibit 5.1 (RH): Baseline cost estimates;
- ATXI Exhibit 5.2 (RH): Example of downed dual-circuit tower; and
- ATXI Exhibit 5.3 (RH): Example of residential subdivision development constructed adjacent to 345 kV transmission line.

**III. RESPONSE TO STAFF WITNESS MR. ROCKROHR**

**Q. Mr. Rockrohr recommends that the Commission consider a route for the Project from Pawnee to Mt. Zion that connects through Kincaid. Has Mr. Rockrohr's testimony changed your opinion regarding such a route?**

**A.** No. As explained in my rehearing direct testimony, a route through Kincaid would cause operational and maintenance problems not presented by a route through Pana. Mr. Rockrohr's direct testimony provides no evidence to alleviate my concern that it may not be possible to terminate an additional (new) transmission line at the existing Kincaid substation. For the reasons explained in my rehearing direct testimony and that of ATXI witness Mr. Dennis Kramer, the Commission should approve a route that connects through Pana, as ATXI proposes.

**Q. Mr. Rockrohr now proposes three locations for the Project's Mt. Zion substation. Has Mr. Rockrohr's testimony changed your opinion regarding where the Mt. Zion substation should be constructed?**

**A.** No. For the reasons explained in my rehearing direct testimony and Mr. Kramer's, I continue to prefer the location that ATXI proposes. That said, I would not object to constructing the Project's Mt. Zion substation at either of the locations that Staff identified in its October 2013 "Identification of Alternate Route" filing as "Sub Site Option 1" and "Sub Site Option 2" (Staff Identification of Alternate Route, Ex. A, p. 15 (Oct. 16, 2013)), as discussed by Mr. Rockrohr in his rehearing direct testimony. While not the best long-term locations for a supply to the Decatur metropolitan area, Transmission Planning analysis shows that these two sites are acceptable, as discussed by Mr. Kramer. However, the third Mt. Zion substation location (Moweaqua) proposed by Mr. Rockrohr for the first time in his rehearing direct testimony will not work, for the reasons also explained by Mr. Kramer. Therefore, I object to it.

**Q. You said that you would not object to Staff's substation site Options 1 and 2. What would ATXI have to do to make either of those sites work with ATXI's proposed routes from Pana to Mt. Zion and Mt. Zion to Kansas?**

**A.** ATXI would have to modify the routes coming into and out of the Mt. Zion substation to account for the more southern location of Staff's substation site. ATXI witness Ms. Donnell Murphy describes in her rehearing rebuttal testimony how ATXI would have to modify the routes, depending on which routes the Commission approves, to accommodate a new southern substation site.

**Q. Have you estimated the cost associated with the various route modifications Ms.**

66 **Murphy describes?**

67 **A.** Yes. ATXI Exhibit 5.1 (RH) provides the baseline cost estimates for the modified routes  
68 going into and out of Staff's southern substation site as well as the substation site proposed by  
69 ATXI for the Mt. Zion substation. These costs do not reflect any construction contingencies.

70 **IV. RESPONSE TO MSSCLPG WITNESSES**

71 **Q. Witnesses on behalf of MSSCLPG testify in support of the "MSCLTF Alternate**  
72 **Route" between Meredosia and Pawnee. Does their testimony change your previous**  
73 **testimony regarding that route?**

74 **A.** No. The route that the Commission should approve between Meredosia and Pawnee is  
75 the route stipulated to by ATXI, the Morgan and Sangamon County Landowners and Tenant  
76 Farmers (MSCLTF) and FutureGen Alliance (FutureGen), which the Commission approved in  
77 its August 2013 Order. The route that the MSSCLPG witnesses support parallels, for its entire  
78 length, an existing 138 kV line. I explained at length in my rebuttal testimony, at hearing, and in  
79 my rehearing direct testimony why paralleling transmission lines causes operational,  
80 maintenance, and reliability issues, and therefore should be avoided when possible. That  
81 evidence shows that when considering difficulty and cost of construction, or difficulty and cost  
82 of operation and maintenance, the Stipulated Route is preferable to any of the other proposals.  
83 Again, parallel lines should only be constructed when the environmental, societal, and land use  
84 issues resulting from a particular route outweigh the potential operational, maintenance, and  
85 reliability issues that result from constructing parallel routes. I do not believe that the  
86 environmental, societal, and land use concerns raised by the MSSCLPG witnesses in their  
87 rehearing direct testimony tip the balance in favor of paralleling the Meredosia to Pawnee route.

88 If anything, as I explain below, their testimony *supports* ATXI's preference against parallel  
89 routing.

90 **Q. Please explain how the MSSCLPG witnesses' testimony supports ATXI's preference**  
91 **against paralleling transmission lines.**

92 **A.** MSSCLPG witnesses Messrs. Niemeyer and Godfrey testify that there is a wind corridor  
93 in the vicinity of Route 104, which is near the route that the Commission approved between  
94 Meredosia and Pawnee, and that existing distribution and transmission lines along Route 104  
95 have been blown down on several recent occasions. The potential for multiple downed  
96 transmission lines is one concern that is alleviated when routes are not constructed parallel to one  
97 another. This is because, as I explained in my rebuttal testimony, parallel lines constitute a threat  
98 to each other. Weather that causes a fault on one line may cause a fault on the other due to their  
99 proximity.

100 **Q. Illinois experienced tornadoes this November. Were any parallel or dual circuited**  
101 **transmission lines downed as a result?**

102 **A.** Yes. The tornadoes touched down north of the existing 138 kV line and, thus, the  
103 proposed MSCLTF Alternate Route that the MSSCLPG supports. In the Peoria area, a double  
104 circuit tower line, with a 138 kV circuit and a 69 kV circuit, was knocked over by the high  
105 winds. ATXI Exhibit 5.2 (RH) shows the downed structure, with the wires for each circuit  
106 spread to the edge of the downed transmission lines' right-of-way. In another instance, a 138 kV  
107 circuit structure was blown over and fell on a distribution circuit. In contrast, in the Kansas area,  
108 a 345 kV circuit experienced the destruction of five structures and damage to the conductors.  
109 Notably, this circuit exactly parallels a 138 kV circuit, but with rights-of-way offset more than a

110 mile. The 138 kV circuit suffered no damage and was able to continue to supply the area.

111 **Q. MSSCLPG witness Mr. Thoma disputes your testimony explaining the risks of**  
112 **parallel lines. He claims that ATXI has not provided “evidence” of actual “construction**  
113 **failures and/or accidents while constructing a new 345 kV line next to an existing 138 kV**  
114 **line.” Can you answer Mr. Thoma’s concern?**

115 **A.** Yes. ATXI has provided evidence regarding “construction failures,” notably my  
116 previous testimony that such outages can and do occur during construction. In fact, within the  
117 last year, an unplanned outage occurred on a 138 kV circuit and a 345 kV circuit during  
118 construction of an adjacent 345 kV circuit.

119 **Q. Several of the MSSCLPG witnesses are concerned that the Meredosia to Pawnee**  
120 **route that the Commission approved will hinder the farming methods they use, such as**  
121 **aerial application of fertilizers. Will ATXI address their concerns?**

122 **A.** Yes. ATXI witnesses Messrs. Jerry Murbarger and Rick Trelz explained in their rebuttal  
123 testimony and at hearing that potential aerial application and other farming impacts are specific  
124 to each property, so they will be discussed individually with landowners during negotiations for  
125 the property rights being sought by ATXI. But they *will* be addressed. ATXI will coordinate  
126 with each landowner on the placement of the poles, and will adjust pole placement where  
127 feasible and appropriate to address specific landowner concerns.

128 **Q. The MSSCLPG witnesses take the position that because landowners along the**  
129 **existing 138 kV line already have a transmission line on their property, constructing a**  
130 **second one there will result in less of an impact on their land or farming operations. How**



131 **do you respond?**

132 **A.** I question whether it's fair to suggest that just because a landowner already has  
133 transmission line poles on their property, they have no objection to a second set. Mr. Leon  
134 Corzine, for example, is an owner of farmland who intervened in this proceeding and who  
135 testified that there are transmission lines on his property. He testified that where there is one set  
136 of lines, it does not affect his ability to use aerial application because, "if there is one set of lines  
137 you can kind of run parallel to those, and with the equipment on the aerial applicators now they  
138 can do that." (Tr. 275.) But, he testified, where there are two sets of lines on his property, he  
139 cannot do aerial application. (*Id.*) Also, as ATXI witness Ms. Murphy testified, during the  
140 public notice process for the Project, landowners whose land already was encumbered by an  
141 existing transmission line easement did not want another line on their property. (Tr. 935-36.)  
142 The presence of two circuits can result in no-travel areas, affecting agricultural production.  
143 Therefore, the MSSCLPG witnesses' suggestion that landowners who already have a  
144 transmission line traversing their farms won't care or won't be impacted as much as the  
145 MSSCLPG members if the Project's Transmission Line is constructed on their property is not  
146 always accurate.

147 **Q. Mr. Thoma suggests that the MSCLTF Alternate Route would be "less intrusive"**  
148 **because it parallels an existing route. Do you agree?**

149 **A.** No, for the reasons I just stated. Also, his suggestion that the new construction will be  
150 less intrusive, to me, implies that the new line can use the same easement as the existing one.  
151 But that is not the case. As I explained in my rebuttal testimony, ATXI will need a new  
152 easement of 150-feet in width for the Project's Transmission Line, and this would be in addition

153 to the easement or property rights that are adjacent or nearby.

154 **Q. Several of the MSSCLPG witnesses also are concerned that construction of the**  
155 **Transmission Line will negatively impact their farmland, or take it out of production**  
156 **altogether, decreasing the land's value without just compensation to them. Can you**  
157 **address their concern?**

158 **A.** I believe ATXI and the Commission already have. I note that the Commission found in  
159 its August 2013 Order:

160 Because the amount of farmland actually taken out of production depends on the  
161 placement of poles, it is not known which route . . . will directly impact the least  
162 amount of farmland. The Commission expects ATXI to fulfill its commitment to  
163 minimize the amount of land taken out of production when selecting locations for  
164 pole foundations. The Commission also expects ATXI to comply with its AIMA  
165 [Agricultural Impact Mitigation Agreement] regardless of which route is chosen.

166 (Order 99.) ATXI certainly intends to fully honor its commitment to minimize the amount of  
167 farmland taken out of production and its agreement to mitigate the impact to farmland.

168 Regarding compensation to landowners, Mr. Trelz put it best at hearing when he testified:

169 ATXI is committed to working with all landowners to fairly compensate them.  
170 So if there are issues, and again, I don't know about them right now. There is just  
171 not enough information, but if there are issues that have some element of damage  
172 to the landowner's ability to farm the ground or if it minimizes crops in any way,  
173 ATXI will negotiate a fair agreement with them.

174 (Tr. 412.)

175 **Q. How do you respond to the MSSCLPG witnesses' concerns that the presence of**  
176 **transmission lines near their farms will interfere with the GPS technology their farm**  
177 **equipment uses and present safety issues, such as energized fences?**

178 **A.** As I explained in my rebuttal testimony, the Transmission Line is designed to limit  
179 electromagnetic field (EMF) levels for off-right-of-way devices. Therefore, it will not affect

wireless technology or metallic objects, including fences, near the line. Also, in my rehearing direct testimony in response to the Robinettes (ATXI Ex. 2.0 (RRH)), I reiterated why the line's EMF will not cause health or safety issues. Finally, I again note that in its August 2013 Order, the Commission stated regarding the line's EMF that it "expects ATXI to construct the facilities in such a way so as to minimize these externalities." (Order 15.) And ATXI will.

**Q. Mr. Niemeyer believes that the existence of a transmission line in the vicinity of his property will preclude its future use as a residential subdivision. Will it?**

**A.** No, I don't believe so. Ameren Services routinely sees residential subdivision developments and large homes constructed next to existing transmission circuits. As an example, ATXI Exhibit 5.3 (RH) shows such residential development, in St. Louis County, Missouri, next to a 345 kV line. Notably, the development was constructed *after* the transmission line was constructed.

**Q. MSSCLPG witness Mr. Bergschneider testifies that surveyors on behalf ATXI have trespassed on his land. How do you respond to this allegation?**

**A.** I don't believe it has merit. First, ATXI operates within the law, and it directs its survey contractors to operate within the law. Second, although I am not a lawyer, I am familiar with Illinois surveying law due to my experience and responsibilities as Senior Director of Transmission Operations and Project Management for Ameren Services, and I note that the law prescribes survey rights relating to the siting of transmission lines following a granting of a Certificate. Also there is an Illinois statute that permits a surveyor, if he finds it necessary in the course of making a survey, to enter onto the land of a party other than the party for whom the survey is being made, without penalty and specifically without liability for trespass.

202 V. CONCLUSION

203 Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony on rehearing?

204 A. Yes, it does.